Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 10-24 remain pending.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 10-24 stand rejected on the basis of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,373. In an effort to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have submitted a Terminal Disclaimer concurrently herewith. This Terminal Disclaimer is believed to be in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c), and, as such, renders the obviousness-type double patenting rejection moot.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of tinge fees.

Dated: February 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted

D. Richard Anderson Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Docket No.: 0649-0898P